

Woodstock Planning and Zoning Regulation Review Subcommittee

June 4, 2015 Lower Level, Woodstock Town Hall

1. Call to Order was at 7:32 PM by Chair J. Gordon
2. Roll Call: J. Adiletta, F. Rich, S. Blodgett, K. Ebbitt, D. Porter, J. Gordon, D. Durst. Planner D. Fey.
3. May 7, 2015 Minutes: F. Rich noted that he had brought up the subject of the cul de sac; J. Gordon noted an inaccurate date about the June Subcommittee meeting. Motion by Rich, seconded by Adiletta, to approve the minutes. Modified minutes were approved unanimously with Porter abstaining.
4. Citizen comments: none
5. Chair's report: Thanks to everyone, whose hard work is appreciated. Please RSVP for the monthly meeting so the Chair can know in advance if a quorum will be present, in order to conduct the Public Hearing.
6. Discussion: Subdivision Regulations
 - a. Chair Gordon and D. Fey are keeping an Action List so as to be able to follow up the discussion points. Some of the points will have multiple places in the Regs when we need to consider modifications.
 - b. D. Fey: Survey Monkey is out there regarding how other towns are handling Open Space set-asides, in terms of calculating the buildable land and the percentage requirements. Some responses have been ambiguous so a follow up may be needed. Report to follow next month.
 - c. Possible elimination of two sections from Sub Regs proposed by D. Durst: redundant sections should be eliminated, with the reader directed to Zoning Regs, Section VI, Town-Wide. In review of the suggestion
 1. D. Fey noted that a part of the E&S text, Certification of E&S Plans, is specific to Subs and would probably be most helpful to the applicant if it stays in that section, but all the rest about Stormwater could be handled as proposed.
 2. It was determined that rather than eliminating the Definitions Section, the verbatim Definitions Section from the Zoning Regulations will be copied/pasted into the Sub Regs, for convenience of the reader while simultaneously avoiding the undesirable situation of having two different sets of Definitions.
 3. A sentence will be added by D. Fey to the Definitions Section in the Subdiv Regs, noting that these are Town-wide Definitions and not exclusive to Subdivisions.

4. Addendums will be reviewed, with some eliminated, others considered for the Zoning Regs since they have Town-wide usefulness. D. Fey will review and report.

The Commission agreed to perform these modifications, which are non-substantive, and batch this work with other simple modifications for a soon- to-be- scheduled Public Hearing. J. Gordon noted other Subdiv Regs modifications include re-examining the necessity for requiring a MIA designation, for appraisal of land proposed for fee-in-lieu of open space set aside, and the requirement for feedback on certain types of applications from other Boards or Commissions.

S. Blodgett was thanked for providing to the Commission members the RI Dept of Environmental Management “Community Guidance to Maintain Working Farms and Forests”.

Discussion of the Fee-In-Lieu of Open Space statutory provision: S. Blodgett- we agree to look at each parcel of land on which development is proposed as unique. J. Adiletta- the value of input from the Conservation Comm gives us a broader view of a parcel but can impact timelines. Note was made by D. Fey that the Conserv Comm is informed of all applications, but those which are requesting the Fee-In-Lieu Option are not flagged. J. Gordon noted he has spoken with J. Kaeding (Conservation Commission Chair) about ways to enhance the working relationship between the two commissions. D. Porter- it would be best if we as a Comm defined the categories of land that we agree are most benefit to the Town should they be put into Open Space, and when we should instead target the Fee-In-Lieu option. Criteria or guidelines seem very important. D. Fey has already begun some modifications of current text with proposed ideas. S. Blodgett-part of the beauty of New England is the patchwork effect that time has brought to towns. East Woodstock is an attractive, pleasant example. F. Rich and D. Porter gave examples of Open Space land that has been mandated as part of previous Subdivisions, but which may not actually serve any known Woodstock goals. In some cases, this has resulted in needlessly smaller lot sizes, which precludes buyers who want more land. Note was made by J. Gordon that in reading Randall Arendt’s work, on which our Subdivision Regs were based, we see several options he suggests for Subdivisions, with more than just his 4-steps, to determine if a town’s priorities are being met. D. Porter and J. Gordon - applicants should have multiple options, not just our two (50% Open Space or Fee), to meet the expectations of various buyers. J. Gordon suggests that if Comm members see a procedure in another community that we could consider or even just modify, to send it to D. Fey for distribution to the Comm. J. Gordon noted his review of the NC State University “Conservation Subdivision handbook”. D. Durst - clarifying language is needed for the applicant as to what circumstances the Comm is most likely to find that will direct the applicant to Open Space and what circumstances should direct the applicant toward the Fee-In-Lieu option. Right now, the Subdiv Regs just launch into language about implementing the Fee-In-Lieu option (#7, p 28) without any text to inform the applicant that the Comm might look favorably or unfavorably on that proposal. Perhaps the applicant can be directed to the

Conserv Comm Checklist as well as the supporting language in the Regs, Contextual Priorities (Ch 6, Resources A-G). Should any of these apply to the parcel, the Comm would tend toward an Open Space proposal, for example. J. Gordon suggests we look at removing the fact that these are in a certain priority sequence, since it can be challenging to put a weight factor onto each priority because each of the listed priorities is important in its own way. Instead, having a list of conservation (open space) priorities allows for a general look at them from a community-wide perspective, yet retains the ability to look at each of them for each individual parcel of land. For example, if a parcel of land contains none of the listed conservation priorities, then a Fee-In-Lieu option may make sense, where as if a parcel contains multiple conservation priorities, then a conservation set aside may make sense.

7. Other: none
8. Agenda for next meeting: Continue with Subdivision Regulations discussion regarding Fee-In-Lieu issues noted above. **NOTE THE MEETING DATE WAS VOTED TO BE CHANGED TO THURSDAY, JULY 9 at 7:30 PM.** So as to avoid the July 4th holiday time (motion J. Adiletta/S. Blodgett; passed unanimously).
9. Adjournment: (motion F. Rich/D. Porter; passed unanimously) was at 9:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Gordon, M.D.
PZC and Subcommittee Chairs